



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

case of newspaper corporations, was reached in *Detroit Daily Post Co. v. McArthur*, 16 Mich. 447; *Haines v. Schultz*, 50 N. J. L. 481; *Eviston v. Cramer*, 57 Wis. 570. Where a corporation is held, it is on the ground of public policy, *Mor., Pri. Corp.* sec. 729, and cases. Of the cases directly in point, in *Bruce v. Reed*, 104 Pa. 408, evidence of the express malice of a reporter was admitted for the purpose of recovering exemplary damages from a corporation, but similar evidence for the same purpose was excluded in *Robertson v. Wyldé*, 2 Moody & R. 101.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC UTILITIES—DEALING IN FUEL.—IN RE MUNICIPAL FUEL PLANTS, 66 N. E. 25 (MASS.).—*Held*, where there is a scarcity in the supply of fuel, falling short of a famine, but yet so great as to create widespread and general distress in the community, so that persons desiring to purchase are unable to supply themselves through private enterprise, municipalities may be authorized by the legislature to establish plants for the sale of fuel. Loring, J., *dissenting*.

This same matter was considered in *Opinion of the Justices*, 155 Mass. 601, where it was held that the purchase by a municipality of coal or wood as fuel and the resale thereof to its citizens, is not, under ordinary circumstances, a public service which can be authorized by the legislature. But Holmes, J., *dissenting*, said: "When money is taken to enable a public body to offer to the public, without discrimination, an article of general public necessity, the purpose is no less public when the article is wood or coal than when it is water, gas, electricity, education, etc." No other court has passed upon the exact question. But municipal ownership of water and lighting plants has been generally upheld. 29 *Am. & Eng. Enc. Law* 2; *Crawfordsville v. Braden*, 130 Ind. 149.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—LIABILITY FOR PROPERTY DESTROYED BY MOB.—CHICAGO V. PENNSYLVANIA CO., 119 FED. 497.—Mobs within the city limits destroyed property which was being protected by the military forces of the State and of the U. S. *Held*, that under a statute imposing liability for property destroyed by mobs, the city was liable.

The principle of making the city or county responsible for property destroyed by mobs is very old. As early as 1285 Parliament provided a remedy against the hundred, county, etc., in cases of robbery and murder. 13 Edw. I. This liability was extended to damage from mobs in the famous Riot Act of 1 George I. Responsibility is not removed because the State and national authorities are assisting in protecting the property. The fact that the State sends troops does not absolve the city from its obligation to preserve the peace. *Allegheny v. Gibson*, 90 Pa. St. 397.

STREET RAILWAYS—CONSENT OF ABUTTING OWNERS—CONTRACT TO PURCHASE.—HAMILTON, ETC., TRACTION CO. V. PARISH, 65 N. E. 1011 (OHIO).—*Held*, that a contract purchasing the consent of an owner of lots abutting on a street, to the construction of a street railroad on such street is valid and not opposed to public policy.

The only decision on this exact question is directly opposed to the present holding. *Doane v. Chicago City R. R. Co.*, 160 Ill. 22. But the general tendency of courts seems to be to construe statutes requiring the consent of abutting land-owners to the construction of street railroads,